

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10, and 32-35 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Claims 1-8, 10, 32 and 33 stand rejected. Claim 9 has been allowed. Independent claims 1, 4 and 32 and dependent claim 8 have been amended. New dependent claims 34 and 35 are added. No new matter is considered to be presented by these amendments and new claims in view of the support contained in the original filed application. .

The amendments of claims 1, 4 and 32 are supported by claims 8 and 9. The amendment of claim 8 is partial deletion according to the amendment of claim 4. New claims 34 and 35 are supported by claim 9.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 4, 8, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsushita (JP 08-276787).

Amended independent claims 1, 4 and 32 comprise the following feature:

notifying of information concerning adjustment of the camera apparatus for minimizing the amount of deviation of the reference pattern according to the amount of deviation of the reference pattern when the reference pattern deviates from the finely adjustable range.

Accordingly, it is possible to achieve improved efficiency of readjustment by notifying information useful for carrying out the readjustment when the shooting direction has been judged to be deviating (page 3, lines 18-21). Applicants respectfully submit that Matsushita does not disclose the claimed combination including this added feature.

With regard to claim 8, the Examiner took the position that Matsushita discloses the test method comprising the notifying step (above), or the display means 58 displays the processing result. Matsushita discloses how to process the image obtained by the camera apparatus, which may be installed inaccurately, but no description about judging whether the camera apparatus is mounted within an adjustable position or not. This means the apparatus of Matsushita inherently undertakes to correct any images obtained by the camera apparatus, which may be mounted

inaccurately. Therefore, Matsushita does not disclose the claimed combination including the added feature described above. Matsushita does not deal with the question of whether the camera apparatus is installed within an adjustable deviation or not. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 4, 32 and their dependant claims 8, 33 are patentably distinguishable over Matsushita.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (JP 08-276787) in view of Takano et al. (US 5,850,254). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (JP 08-276787) in view of Tomitaka (US 5,355,163). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (JP 08-276787) in view of Hamaguri (US 6,462,777). These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to add a feature not previously claimed as part of their respective combinations. Specifically, each of the independent claims now requires: notifying of information concerning adjustment of the camera apparatus for minimizing the amount of deviation of the reference pattern according to the amount of deviation of the reference pattern when the reference pattern deviates from the finely adjustable range.

Matsushita does not disclose this feature.

As for notifying regarding an improper mount of camera apparatus, Takano discloses the warning device 11 and the warning step 1009, 1014 and 1019. In the specification, for example, "[w]hen it is decided in the process 1015 that the required correction quantity of the image data is out of the movable range in the image window (1018), however, a warning is given to a driver through the warning issuance deciding unit 752 and the warning device 11 (1019)" (column 6, lines 43-48). This means that the warning device 11 informs only the image sensor 2 is out of proper range, and no information of required amount for adjusting the image sensor to minimize the deviation. The other references of record do not contain any teachings on this point.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and its dependant claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10 are patentably distinguishable over Matsushita.

If any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032405.041.

If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed herewith, such an extension is requested. The extension fee should be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032405.041.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:   
Glenn J. Perry, Reg. No. 28,458  
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: 202/973-2611  
Facsimile: 202/263-4311

Date: May 5, 2006